



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1002/msc.1240](https://doi.org/10.1002/msc.1240)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Meade, L. B., Bearne, L. M., & Godfrey, E. L. (2018). Comprehension and face validity of the Exercise Adherence Rating Scale in patients with persistent musculoskeletal pain. *Musculoskeletal Care*, 16(3), 409-412. <https://doi.org/10.1002/msc.1240>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Comprehension and face validity of the Exercise Adherence Rating Scale in patients with persistent musculoskeletal pain

Keywords: persistent pain, exercise, adherence, musculoskeletal, physiotherapy, questionnaire, measurement

Introduction

Active treatments, such as prescribed exercise, tend to be effective in reducing pain and increasing function for common persistent musculoskeletal (PMSK) pain conditions, such as low back pain or osteoarthritis (Geneen et al., 2017). However, the majority of people do not adhere to their prescribed exercise, and therefore may not experience their intended benefits (Jordan, Holden, Mason, & Foster, 2010). Research into exercise adherence is minimal, largely due to the lack of standardised measurement methods (Beinart, Goodchild, Weinman, Ayis, & Godfrey, 2013; Geneen et al., 2017). This results in a deficiency of homogeneous data to allow for comparison and formulation of treatment standards. The Exercise Adherence Rating Scale (EARS) was developed as the first standardised, validated measure of exercise adherence to prescribed home exercise (Newman-Beinart et al., 2017) and is currently being translated to nine other languages.

The EARS is a brief, self-report measure comprised of three sections; section A requires participants to document their exercise prescription given by their healthcare provider, section B is a 6-item measure of adherence and section C is a 10-item measure of factors that influences (helps or hinders) exercise adherence. Construct validity was confirmed through exploratory categorical data factor analysis on section B of the questionnaire (Newman-Beinart et al., 2017). When explored in a population with persistent low back pain, all items loaded strongly on one factor and the test-retest reliability was high.

However, the interpretation and comprehensibility of the EARS has not been measured in a wider musculoskeletal pain population.

The aim of the current study was to assess the face validity and comprehensibility of the EARS. To achieve this, the cognitive interviewing technique ‘think aloud’ was employed as it provides a means of obtaining an empirical exploration of cognitive processes while performing a task (Green & Gilhooly, 1996). This allows potential issues in the interpretation and comprehension of the EARS to be explored. It has been used in a variety of contexts to test questionnaire comprehension, such as the Theory of Planned Behaviour Questionnaire (Darker & French, 2009), Brief Illness Perception Questionnaire (van Oort, Schröder, & French, 2011) and habit measures (Gardner & Tang, 2014).

Methods

Participants

Following previous research employing the ‘think aloud’ protocol (Darker & French, 2009; Gardner & Tang, 2014) a sample of 20 participants was deemed appropriate to capture rich, heterogenous data for analysis. Participants were recruited via poster on a UK university campus and an outpatient physiotherapy department. Screening questions were used to determine eligibility and participants were invited to attend a face to face appointment with the researcher. Individuals were eligible if they reported to have been diagnosed by a registered healthcare professional with PMSK pain and had been prescribed exercise as treatment. Individuals who could not fluently read or speak English were ineligible for the study.

Procedure

Ethical approval was acquired through a local university Institutional Review Board, the national research ethics committee and research governance approval from relevant National Health Service Foundation Trusts.

Prior to completing the questionnaire, written informed consent was obtained, and the participants were read instructions adapted by the original protocol by Green & Gilhooly (1996). Participants were not asked to explain the reasons for their thoughts or responses, but to simply vocalise all thoughts that are normally silent while completing a questionnaire (full instructions available on request). Participants first practised the technique using a few unrelated questions before being given section B and C of the EARS and the audio recording commenced. Data was transcribed verbatim.

Analysis

A thematic analysis approach was applied (Braun & Clarke, 2008). This process focuses on establishing themes in transcribed data, in this case, problems encountered with understanding and interpreting the questionnaire. The initial validation study (Newman-Beinart et al., 2017) analysed sections B and C of the scale separately, therefore the face validity was assessed similarly. The first six items measuring adherence behaviours (section B) were coded while the subsequent 10 questions pertaining to what influenced exercise adherence (section C) were assessed and coded together. Each verbal response was identified as a segment, generating 120 segments for the first questionnaire (6 items x 20 participants) and 200 (10 items x 20 participants) for the second.

Results

Twenty participants (range 19-65 years, $M=34.6$, $SD=13.9$, 70% female) provided written informed consent and were enrolled onto the study. Participants were diagnosed with persistent low back pain (7), fibromyalgia, (4), knee pain (4), hip pain (3) and osteoarthritis (2). The mean duration to complete section A and B was 5.97 minutes.

45% of the participants reported no issues with the 6-item adherence scale (section B) and 80% of the participants did not experience any issues with the 10-item help or hinder scale (section C). Issues were reported in 6% of responses; 20 issues out of a total of 320 segments, were identified. 16 issues in section B and four in section C. Two themes were identified in the data: interpretation difficulties (1.1 confusion between physical activity (PA) and prescribed exercise, 1.2 spontaneous inference) and comprehension difficulties.

Interpretation difficulty

This theme described issues in interpretation, including deviations from original intended meaning of the question as well as the participant's uncertainty in their response. Two subthemes were identified.

1.1 Confusion between PA and prescribed exercise. Eight respondents reported 11 issues (55% of all issues) due to confusion between general PA behaviour and specific prescribed exercise (Table 1). Some participants recalled instances of engaging in general PA, such as walking to work, instead of the exercises prescribed by their healthcare professional when they responded to the question.

P1 (female, back pain) "Completely disagree because I am still trying to stay healthy and still trying to go to the gym and stay active even if I forget to do the exercises or one of them I'm still going and working out"

1.2 Spontaneous inference. This theme describes issues that participants experienced responding to questions because they had not received or understood a specific prescription

of exercise, and therefore developed a hypothetical scenario on which to base their response.

This accounted for four concerns (20%) generated by three respondents.

P5 (female, knee pain) “Well my recommendations haven’t been very specific, but as often as recommended by myself so far ...I said how many (repetitions) I want to do and I do that.”

Comprehension difficulty

This theme accounted for instances where the participant did not comprehend the question itself, which led them to seek clarification from the researcher. Four participants did not understand the meaning of a question or the scoring system, for example they queried where a middle rating on the Likert scale would be. This accounted for five problems (25%).

P8 (male, back pain) is this question saying that I feel confident of the fact that I actually do do them, or is it asking that I feel confident when I do them (the exercises).

Discussion

Our findings indicate that the EARS was comprehensible to the majority of our participants with PMSK pain and has good face validity. Two themes describing a small number of issues pertaining to the comprehension of the EARS were identified. The EARS is currently the only exercise adherence questionnaire to have undergone face validity testing (McLean et al., 2016). However, refinements to the instructions of the EARS are suggested to negate some of the issues encountered by our participants.

Participants reported more issues with Section B, which measures the levels of exercise adherence, than section C, which asks questions about what influences adherence. Most issues were encountered when participants responded to questions and referenced their general PA behaviour (rather than the exercise or PA recommendations from their healthcare

provider). This may be due to several factors. While participants did not have difficulties interpreting the individual questions, the instructions on the questionnaire may have caused confusion. This may require rewording to ensure participants understand which activity or behaviour to base their responses on. The initial questionnaire instructions may not be specific enough to prompt respondents to consider their prescribed exercises or PA only when answering the questions.

Confusion may also be due to an unclear exercise prescription from a healthcare provider. Some participants stated that they were not given specific recommendations about exercise dosage and so had difficulty responding to the questionnaire. In this situation, participants referred to hypothetical scenarios; as they did not have precise recommendations to comment on and therefore were unable to answer the questions posed. This was particularly evident in participants with wide spread pain conditions, such as fibromyalgia. The four participants with fibromyalgia (50% of those with problems answering the questionnaire) reported that they had received nonspecific exercise or PA advice. This may indicate that more specific prescription of exercise and PA and checks that a patient understands these needs to be included in a healthcare consultation, as well as more general discussions around the collaboratively agreed treatment goals and action plans, including exercise dosage or PA recommendations.

PA is a multifaceted construct defined as “any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that results in energy expenditure”(Caspersen, Powell, & Christenson, 1985, p.129). However, PA recommendations can also be measured by the EARS if the parameters are well defined and measurable, for example walking for 30 minutes a day at a pace that makes you slightly out of breath. Our participants may not have been aware of the differences between PA and exercise, making our questionnaires difficult to interpret. The scale may need to provide better definitions of these behaviours, in line with other scales measuring similar

140 constructs, such as the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (Godin & Shephard,
141 1985).

142 Five comments referred to issues with comprehension of the rating scale, only minor
143 clarification was required prior to the participants successfully completing these questions.
144 Amendments to the instructions may alleviate these issues with comprehension.

145 **Conclusion**

146 This study demonstrates that there is good comprehension and face validity of the EARS
147 questionnaire, adding to the evidence that it is a robust measure of adherence. Healthcare
148 professionals should be aware that there is potential for people with PMSK pain to
149 misunderstand the questionnaire if exercise or PA specifications are unclear or not
150 understood. Instructions to the scale could be refined to specify that questions refer to
151 prescribed exercise or specific PA recommendations. The development of this scale will aid
152 in providing a better understanding of exercise adherence behaviours.

References

- Beinart, N. A., Goodchild, C., Weinman, J., Ayis, S., & Godfrey, E. L. (2013). Individual and intervention-related factors associated with adherence to home exercise in chronic low back pain: A systematic review. *The Spine Journal, 13*, 1940-1950.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Caspersen, C. J., Powell, K. E., & Christenson, G. M. (1985). Physical activity, exercise, and physical fitness: Definitions and distinctions for health-related research. *Public Health Reports (1974-), 100*(2), 126-131.
- Darker, C. D., & French, D. P. (2009). What sense do people make of a theory of planned behaviour questionnaire? *Journal of Health Psychology, 14*(7), 861-871.
10.1177/1359105309340983
- Gardner, B., & Tang, V. (2014). Reflecting on non- reflective action: An exploratory think-aloud study of self- report habit measures (report). *British Journal of Health Psychology, 19*(2), 258. 10.1111/bjhp.12060
- Geneen, L., Moore, R., Clarke, C., Martin, D., Colvin, L., & Smith, B. (2017). Physical activity and exercise for chronic pain in adults: An overview of cochrane reviews (review). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (1)*10.1002/14651858.CD011279.pub2.
- Godin, G., & Shephard, R. J. (1985). A simple method to assess exercise behaviour in the community. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science, 10*, 141-146.

- Green, C., & Gilhooly, K. (1996). Protocol analysis: Practical implementation. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 55-74) British Psychological Society.
- Jordan, J. L., Holden, M. A., Mason, E. J., & Foster, N. E. (2010). Interventions to improve adherence to exercise for chronic musculoskeletal pain in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (1)10.1002/14651858.CD005956.pub2
- McLean, S., Holden, M., Potia, T., Gee, M., Mallett, R., Bhanbhro, S., . . . Haywood, K. (2016). Quality and acceptability of measures of exercise adherence in musculoskeletal settings: A systematic review. *Rheumatology*, , 1-13.
- Newman-Beinart, N., Norton, S., Dowling, D., Gavriloff, D., Vari, C., Weinman, J. A., & Godfrey, E. L. (2017). The development and initial psychometric evaluation of a measure assessing adherence to prescribed exercise: The exercise adherence rating scale (EARS). *Physiotherapy*, 103(2), 180-185. 10.1016/j.physio.2016.11.001
- van Oort, L., Schröder, C., & French, D. P. (2011). What do people think about when they answer the brief illness perception questionnaire? A 'think- aloud' study. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 16, 231. 10.1348/135910710X500819

Table 1: Breakdown of issues per question

	Interpretation Difficulty		Comprehension difficulty
	Confusion between PA and prescribed exercise	Spontaneous inference	
Exercise Adherence			
1. I do my exercises as often as recommended	x	xx	x
2. I forget to do my exercises			
3. I do less exercise than recommended by my healthcare professional	xxxxxx	x	x
4.I fit my exercises into my regular routine	x		
5. I don't get around to doing my exercises			xx
6. I do most, or all, of my exercises	x	x	
Helps or Hinders			
1. I don't have time to do my exercises			
2. Other commitments prevent me from doing my exercises			
3. I don't do my exercises when I am tired			
4. I feel confident about doing my exercises			x
5. My family and friends encourage me to do my exercises			
6. I do my exercises to improve my health	x		
7. I do my exercises because I enjoy them	xx		
8. I adjust the way I do my exercises to suit myself			
9. I stop exercising when my pain is worse			
10. I'm not sure how to do my exercises			

x indicates one participant experiencing theme identified